

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached six sheet of replacement formal drawings replace the six sheets of drawings as originally filed. No changes have been made to the content of the drawings.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets (6)

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-4, 8-11, and 13-18 are amended. Claims 22-28 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 29-35 are added.

Claims 1-21 and 29-35 are pending in the application.

The specification has been amended to correct informalities.

It is believed the attached replacement sheets of drawings overcome the drawing objections.

The claims have been amended to more precisely claim the feature of executing a router command that specifies an address prefix identifier, where the address prefix identifier is implemented as *a non-numeric representation* of an address prefix required as an operand of the router command stored in the configuration file (see, e.g., page 6, lines 21-24 of the specification, Figures 4A, 4B, and 4C illustrating the address prefix identifier 70 as "prefix1", and Figures 5A and 5B illustrating the address prefix identifier 82 as "prefix-1").

The claims as amended also specify that execution of a declaration command (e.g., 76a of Figure 4A) causes the storing in the router of an address prefix value into a prescribed storage location that is assigned to the address prefix identifier. In particular, the claims as amended specify that the declaration command can specify at least one of an address prefix value associated with the address prefix identifier (see, e.g., entry 76a of Figure 4A, page 6, lines 25-28), or a source for the address prefix value (e.g., router command 76i of Figure 5B specifies retrieving the address prefix according to DHCP using a client resource 50, see page 8, lines 20-27).

The claims as amended also specify that in response to parsing the router command that specifies the address prefix identifier, the router can retrieve the address prefix value for the address prefix identifier *from the prescribed storage location assigned to the address prefix identifier*, and execute the router command based on applying the address prefix values retrieved from the prescribed storage location as the operand in the router command.

Hence, the claims as amended precisely identify that the address prefix identifier refers to a ***non-numeric representation*** that is stored within router commands ***within a configuration file stored in the router***. The router commands include at least a declaration command that causes retrieval and storage of the address prefix values associated with the address prefix identifier into a prescribed storage location within the router and that is assigned to the address prefix identifier. Hence, the subsequent commands that specify the address prefix identifier can be executed based on retrieving the address prefix value from a prescribed storage locations assigned to the address prefix identifier, and executing the router command using the address prefix value retrieved from the prescribed storage location.

Hence, the claimed address prefix identifier in the form of a non-numeric representation enables use of an "alias" within router commands that enables dynamic assignment of address prefixes within router configuration commands. Further, multiple address prefixes can be applied concurrently to the same address prefix identifiers, illustrated for example in Figure 4B.

The foregoing amendments render moot the outstanding rejection under 35 USC §103 in view of Troan et al. (also referred to as "the IETF Draft") and Crawford et al. ("also referred to as "RFC 2894"). Further, it is respectfully submitted that the claims as amended are patentable over the hypothetical combination of the IETF Draft and RFC 2894.

In particular, the IETF Draft by Troan et al. describes DHCPv6 prefix delegation ("DHCP-PD") in general, and describes no more than a requesting router acting as a DHCP client requesting prefixes to be assigned. In fact, page 3 of Troan et al (paragraph 2 of Sec. 1) specifies that the prefix delegation mechanism is intended for "simple delegation of prefixes from a delegating router to requesting routers". Troan et al. describes the DHCP-PD protocol between the requesting router and the delegating router, including use of an Identity Association for Prefix Delegation (IA_PD) Option that includes an Identity Association Identifier (IAID) that enables the DHCP client to keep track of requests with the delegating router.

Each of the independent claims, however, specify that the non-numeric address prefix identifier is ***stored in router configuration files stored within the router***. Troan et al. provides no disclosure or suggestion of a requesting router outputting a non-numeric address prefix

identifier, as claimed. Moreover, Troan et al. provides no disclosure or suggestion of any configuration files or commands that are implemented within the requesting router. Finally, Troan et al. provides no disclosure or suggestion of retrieving the address prefix value (stored at a prescribed location ***within the router***) in response to parsing a router command (of a configuration file) that specifies the ***address prefix identifier***. In fact, Troan et al. provides no teaching whatsoever as to how the requesting router should subnet a delegated prefix (e.g., /48) into smaller prefixes (e.g., /64 prefixes). Hence, one skilled in the art could simply use a circuit that appends the delegated prefix with link interface identifiers.

Hence, Troan et al. neither discloses nor suggests the features of the claims as amended.

RFC 2894 by Crawford et al. fails to disclose or suggest the claimed execution of the declaration command (specifying the address prefix identifier and either its corresponding address prefix value or a source for the address prefix value) that is ***stored within a configuration file***, as claimed. RFC 2894 teaches away from these claimed features by teaching that the router renumbering commands are sent to the routers. Page 3 explicitly specifies that the routers are instructed to create new prefixes under the control of a network manager (see page 3, second full paragraph, for full paragraph). Hence, no change is made in a router unless the "Match-Prefix" values specified in the Prefix Control Operation (PCO) option matches an existing prefix assigned to a router interface, in which case the existing prefix is replaced with the "UsePrefix" value in the PCO option (see, e.g., pages 5 and 9-12).

Hence, RFC 2894 teaches away from the claimed execution of commands ***stored within a configuration file*** in the router by requiring a router to receive commands from a network manager; in contrast, the claim declaration command causes storage of an address prefix value associated with a non-numeric address prefix identifier in a prescribed storage location within the router, enabling subsequent commands specifying the address prefix identifier to be executed based on retrieval of the address prefix value from the prescribed storage location.

For these and other reasons, the pending claims are allowable over the applied prior art.

In view of the above, it is believed this application is in condition for allowance, and such a Notice is respectfully solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including any missing or insufficient fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a), to Deposit Account No. 50-1130, under Order No. 10-005, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'LRS', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Leon R. Turkevich
Registration No. 34,035

Customer No. 23164
(202) 261-1059
Date: November 30, 2007